

FY06-07 CREP Grant Program Application Status

7/1/2005

| | Application Received/ Postmarked | CC-Authorized TA Distribution | CS Applied For |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Asotin | 27-Jun | 17,409.50 | 203,740.00 |
| Benton | 27-Jun | 4,500.00 | 40,700.00 |
| C Klickitat | 28-Jun | 1,500.00 | |
| Chelan | 28-Jun | 500.00 | |
| Clallam | 28-Jun | | 31,321.60 |
| Clark | 28-Jun | 3,906.25 | 14,468.00 |
| Columbia | 27-Jun | 14,750.00 | 122,467.00 |
| Cowlitz | | | |
| E Klickitat | 28-Jun | 1,250.00 | |
| Jefferson | 27-Jun | 15,625.00 | |
| King/Pierce | 27-Jun | 2,500.00 | 4,000.00 |
| Kitsap | 28-Jun | 1,500.00 | 5,700.00 |
| Lewis/Grays Harbor | 27-Jun | 15,625.00 | 15,493.00 |
| Mason | 24-Jun | 3,906.25 | |
| Okanogan | 28-Jun | 3,906.25 | 8,000.00 |
| Pacific | 28-Jun | 3,906.25 | 14,805.00 |
| Pomeroy | 27-Jun | 7,812.50 | |
| Skagit | 28-Jun | 35,000.00 | 68,359.00 |
| Snohomish | 27-Jun | 7,812.50 | 78,000.00 |
| So Yakima | 28-Jun | 1,500.00 | |
| Thurston | 27-Jun | 1,500.00 | 4,740.00 |
| Underwood | 28-Jun | 1,500.00 | |
| Wahkiakum | 28-Jun | 3,906.25 | |
| Walla Walla | 28-Jun | 20,750.00 | 359,908.65 |
| Whatcom | 27-Jun | 49,354.75 | |
| Whitman | 28-Jun | 1,250.00 | |
| Totals | | 221,170.50 | 971,702.25 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 06 CREP Comments from Districts | |
| OK, here's how I remember things from last year. Carolyn suggested a formula based on number of contracts and FTEs. Assumptions were made that one employee could manage 25 contracts. This is where we first thought about breaking out the TA into tiers. Tier 4 was 0-5 contracts, Tier 3 was 6-10 contracts, Tier 2 was 11-24 contracts and Tier 1 was >24 contracts. You'll see by the attached file "Carolyn Kelly Suggestion" how that worked out. Terry Bruegman's original suggestion was for each district to receive \$1,000 per contract and \$50 per acre. That is approximately how the FY2004 allocation was made. The final recommendation by the Committee was to combine the two formulas. For Tier 1 districts they received either Bruegman's formula or the amount they requested. The remaining tiers received allocations according to Carolyn's suggestion, including bonuses for extra contracts. The districts that were willing to cluster received other consideration and were moved into a higher tier. It should be noted that a few of the tier 1 districts took less money than they were eligible for under the formula. | Asotin |
| I am going to be honest you you. Scott Manley did not believe in this program and didn't push it with anyone. Then Dennis came on Board a year ago and believed in the program which I am sure you understand that you need to believe and understand it in order to "sell" it to landowners. This District has gone through a great deal within the last few years. I have learned the hard way not to just focus on my job but EVERYTHING the district is involved in, can be involved in, and try to learn it all. Anyway, I do believe this is the reason why we are beginning to "blossom". With \$5,000, it is hard to get anything done, unless you have money from other sources to help with over-head and salaries to have the time to go out and talk to people. I hope this justifies my asking for \$18,000 for 06 grant. | Benton |
| | C Klickitat |
| We have the 2 contracts. The maintenance period will end next spring. At that point, I believe our participation in the program will end. Is that correct? I anticipate approximately \$2,000 at the most will be needed in Technical Assistance for the next year. Both landowners will most likely be watering their sites this summer and will qualify for maintenance payments. Again, I estimated \$700 maximum for cost share needs. We will not be seeking additional contracts this coming year, only to complete the 2 contracts we have. Let me know if you need anything else. | Chelan |
| | Clallan |
| | Clark |
| CCD has in the past been able to reduce WCC cost due to NRCS support in plan development and our opportunity to cover program cost with other funding sources. We elected to do so with the intent it was program beneficial. I am requesting \$59,000 for FY 06 to administer the CREP within the District. I believe that our cost will increase this year due to the fact that NRCS will not have the staff time to support our efforts as they have in the past and our funding request thru BPA for FY 06 will also reduce the funding support received in the past. With these considerations in mind I expect to charge more of CCD staff time to WCC CREP TA funding. | Columbia |
| | Cowlitz |
| | E Klickitat |
| | Foster Creek |
| | Franklin |
| | Grays Harbor |
| One year ago we hired a CREP planner who has done a great job with the Jefferson/Clallam program. We cannot afford to lose him. Putting off a decision that puts a hold, real or implied, on our program and his livelihood is unacceptable to us. Al Latham | Jefferson |
| | King |
| | Kitsap |
| | Kittitas |
| We estimated \$600 per acre for new contracts and \$1000 per contract for existing contracts. We did not bring into account the projected contracts. The anticipated and projected contracts does not include any contracts that may generated by marketing. The amount of TA money we are requesting does not include any marketing funds. I am trying to be as realistic as possible with the anticipated contracts and TA funds requested due to the fact that the funds are limited. | Lewis |
| | Mason |
| | No Yakima |
| In the past, the Okanogan Conservation District has had signed CRP-2's and prepared plans spending extensive time contacting and talking with potential cooperators only to have these people back out at the last minute (for various reasons). In my brief three (3) years administering the CREP program for the OCD, this has happened approximately 50% of the time. In other words, only half of the plans we prepare reach the contract stage. Several of these projects were quite large (by Okanogan Conservation District standards). Thus, our TA costs seem rather disproportionate when compared with those of other CDs. Other factors, which have driven up time, and thereby costs, are 1) cooperators' confusion about the complex CREP requirements that necessitate inordinate amounts of time explaining the requirements and coordinating with FSA to help the landowners through the process, 2) naturally harsh site conditions (made harsher in the last 2 years by drought) that necessitate replants (we are changing to over-planting to alleviate this problem), 3) some past CREP projects were quite small, thereby driving up the per-acre costs, and, 4) talking about participating in the CREP with more than a few prospective CREP cooperators who c | Okanogan |
| | Pacific |
| | Pierce |
| | Pomeroy |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| | S Yakima |
| To be equitable, I have greatly revised my request based on the following: I asked only for planning money for the four cooperators we are currently working with. I based that on the formula of \$1000/plan and \$50/acre. I took out the extra for monitoring. As long as the expense is allowable overall, we can fit it into the budget. I would ask that funding be placed in reserve to cover future anticipated sign-ups, that I then could request extra funding for new sign-ups at the above planning rate. I would include them in my overall budget for implementation the next fiscal year. Therefore, my budget request of what I must have to proceed is substantially less (\$46,650) than the first at \$93,350. (a 33% decrease) I felt that if others, even the lowest tier, had to budget based on the factors discussed, then so should I. | Skagit |
| Hi George, I've attached our numbers as requested. I asked for \$38,000 because that includes our additional request from March 05. Remember, we have 6 people dipping into this fund. (2 planners, 2 engineers, a bookkeeper and manager). And often we use commission money or DOE grant as match, so we are spending a lot more time that is apparent from the numbers. I also want to add that even though our cost per acre seems high, there are some contracts we have worked on for several months that fell through due to landowner decisions after CRP2's were signed and we had written the plan and created the maps. Just a look behind the actual numbers. Jamie | Snohomish |
| It's interesting to see the large range in projected cost/acre. Our cost isn't astronomical, but I expect that we can bring it down substantially. Our program is small, and we made some mistakes early in the process. We now have a good understanding of how to implement these projects effectively. However, we are still having problems getting FSA to pay legitimate expenses. I have spent a large portion of my time trying to straighten out these administrative problems, contributing to the higher cost per acre. I would much rather spend my time getting projects implemented, but this will be unlikely until we can get FSA to cooperate. There is way too much money at stake to have a landowner implement the project according to NRCS specs, then have FSA decide not to pay. This year we have used at least \$4,000 of our dollars to backfill our CREP TA funding. I will keep you posted regarding this iss! ue. | Thurston |
| | Underwood |
| | Wahkiakum |
| If it is the intent of the Commission to set these as goals that must be met, (as was done once before) please let us know so we can consider this more carefully. | Walla Walla |
| | Whatcom |
| | Whidbey Island |
| | Whitman |

Skagit Conservation District CREP TA Funding Background

How many contracts / acres require management in the fiscal year 2006?

Currently have 69 contracts totaling 469.8 acres that will require maintenance during FY06. Requesting funding for usual maintenance, with minimal budgeted for occurrences such as flooding events, drought loss, and/or animal predation.

How many contracts CRP 2/acres are in the planning stages for the next 12 months?

We currently are working on 4 projects covering 77+ acres. The landowners have not signed CRP 2s, but are asking for planning assistance and are very strong candidates.

How many CRP2 are likely to be recruited in the next 12 months?

We anticipate a minimum of twelve new recruits in the next year, and are hopeful of more based on an increased emphasis on marketing and the following positive indicators:

- Co-managers have released their Chinook Recovery Plan for the Skagit Basin
- Shared strategy recommendations favor voluntary riparian programs that support sustainable agriculture
- Skagit Tribal/Agricultural Alliance has been signed by two tribes and 4 major agricultural groups
- Skagit County is working on positive solutions to current GMHB remand regarding protective measures on critical areas
- Current emphasis on implementing riparian bmps to address temperature TMDLs in target watersheds

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Funding Breakout - FY 2006 CREP TA Request | | | | |
| Task: | Cost | % of Request | Cost per unit | Notes |
| Planning | \$7,850 | 9% | \$1000 plan + \$50/acre for 4 plans/77 acres | SCD receives no NRCS technical assistance for CREP |
| Implementation | \$7,500 | 8% | \$1,500/contract/5 new projects | |
| Recruitment | \$12,000 | 13% | Increased marketing emphasis – see notes below | |
| Maintenance/Evaluation | \$42,000 | 45% | \$609/contract/69 current contracts | |
| Administration | \$24,000 | 25% | \$320/contract/75 contracts avg. | |
| Total FY 2006 Request | \$93,350 | | | Request is less than current allocation |

JEFFERSON COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT

205 W. Patison St., Port Hadlock, WA 98339 - Phone (360) 385-4105 latham@jefferson.wsu.edu

CLALLAM CONSERVATION DISTRICT

111 E. 3d, Rm 2a, Port Angeles WA 98362 (360-452-1912 x5) joe-holtrop@wa.nacdn.net

6-16-05

To: Conservation Commission

From: Al Latham, JCCD Mgr/Tech., Joe Holtrop, Clallam CD Mgr.

Subject: CREP funding

To expand on the information you are considering regarding the CREP funding levels, we hope the following will be useful.

The spreadsheet presented to you for the June 15 tele-conference indicated that the Jefferson/Clallam Cluster was in tier 1 and scheduled to receive \$62,500 for 2005. It also indicated that we had no new contracts since 6/30/04, which was cause for concern.

Currently the Jefferson/Clallam Cluster has 6 contracts totaling 47 acres in the planning stages. Three have signed CRP-2's and three have very high likelihood of becoming contracts.

The number of contracts since 6/30/04 by itself is not a good representation of CREP workload in our cluster. Until July 2004 Jefferson and Clallam CD's had not received enough funding to hire staff for CREP and were using existing staff for the program, in addition to their other responsibilities. In Clallam CD five different staff members were responsible for managing CREP over the first five years of the program, devoting a total of less than one day per week to the program. In Jefferson County, CREP was one of a number of Al's responsibilities. Nevertheless, the two CDs' collective efforts resulted in 18 contracts with 157 acres enrolled. However, there was never enough staff time to properly follow through on implementation and maintenance. In 2004 Jefferson/Clallam joined our resources to hire one FTE to run the program in both Districts.

We view CREP as an essential part of our salmon recovery and water quality improvement programs. High water temperatures and channels clogged with reed canarygrass are two "limiting factors" for salmon recovery in the agricultural areas, especially in Jefferson County. In eastern Clallam County low precipitation makes plant establishment challenging on some sites. CREP is the best program available to improve the situation since it not only plants trees/shrubs which will result in shading of the stream, it is the only program providing long term maintenance for plant survival and monetary compensation to the landowner for land taken out of production.

It is also an extremely complex program to administer and understand. The program in both Districts had suffered from not having someone who could concentrate on the program and deal with all the complexities of program signup and administration – the program really needs someone who can focus on the program without a lot of other responsibilities. The billing process alone for work done can be daunting with FSA cost-share, Conservation Commission cost-share and PIP loans. The signup process is also complex with multiple FSA

and Commission documents that landowners find difficult to understand. So, it takes a long time for someone starting out to reach an effective level of understanding of the program.

When Luke Cherney, Jefferson/Clallam CREP Planner, started in July 2004 he was confronted with having to organize site prep contracts for most of the existing contracts for both new planting and replants, as well as maintenance for projects being overgrown with canarygrass. After only two weeks on the job the CREP database was due and he was responsible not only for learning how to use the database but had to input all the information for 18 contracts. Then it was planting season and he was responsible for getting 56,000 trees in the ground. Until recently there was little time to spend generating new contracts. He has done a great job of taking over the program and future success depends on us being able to maintain his position.

Since CREP started there has been a downward trend in new contracts generated statewide. There are a number of reasons for this and following are some affecting program expansion here, and probably elsewhere.

- The “early adopters” of a new program have been signed up. These are the “low hanging fruit” that generate good numbers of contracts when a new program is started.
- When CREP started there was a lot of concern among landowners that if they didn’t take advantage of CREP they would end up losing a wider buffer to new regulations anyway. At that time there were threats (real or imagined) of mandatory 250-300 ft buffers, which generated a lot of interest in the program. This threat/concern has diminished in recent years reducing that incentive to sign up for CREP.
- When CREP started the minimum buffer requirement for most of the Jefferson CD ag land was 50’ due to the wet soil types. When the new buffer standard was adopted, ostensibly with a 35’ minimum buffer, it actually raised the minimum in those areas to 100’, which made the program less attractive to landowners. This was very unfortunate because a 50 ft of buffer on those sites addresses the main salmon habitat and water quality concerns on those small streams. We have tried to find some flexibility from FSA and NRCS on this issue to no avail. There is very good potential to sign up over a mile of continuous stream reach (2 miles streambank) in one area with a 50’ buffer but not 100’, and this is one of the most temperature-impaired reaches the program was designed to help. Two landowners in Clallam CD were very interested in enrolling when they learned their minimum buffer width may be reduced with the new standard; however, after conducting the site analysis it turned out their buffers actually increased. Needless to say, they declined to enroll. Much has been made of the new standard’s 35’ minimum buffer but this is only available on certain sites – it would be much better if it were available on all sites, especially small streams in narrow valleys or streams that are spring fed and are not prone to flooding.
- The paperwork involved in signing up for the program and billing for work done is extremely daunting to the landowners, not to mention staff. The last time Al signed up a landowner they were presented with 35 pages of forms full of legalese and plans that they (and I) were expected to understand. This is an impediment to landowner interest in the program. Every time we visit a farm with a CREP contract, even on other business or just to say hello, the first words out of the landowner’s mouth is “What papers do I have to sign now?” To fully appreciate this it would be interesting for Commission Members to review a complete signup packet for CREP, and look at it from the viewpoint of landowners with some concern about involvement in government programs.

- Having to bill two agencies (FSA & Commission) for work completed, as well as the paperwork involved in the PIP loans is also daunting to the landowners, even with our staff putting it together for their signature.
- We have had problems until recently with timely processing of bills by FSA, which makes for poor relationships with contractors who we depend on to do the planting and maintenance. This has been greatly improved recently and we thank the overworked FSA staff for their efforts. Also FSA combined county committees so the Clallam/Jefferson Committee no longer exists and FSA committee meetings and office are “across the water” in Snohomish County. Landowners are reluctant to travel to Snohomish Co. for FSA signup and paperwork, and CREP is not something that can be explained over the phone. It is important to note that FSA, due to decisions in Washington DC, has received more program responsibilities along with staff reductions at the local offices.

Hopefully this gives you a better idea of the situation in the Jefferson/Clallam CREP Cluster, and perhaps some of the issues facing the program statewide. Having the funding to hire 1 FTE to administer the program in both districts has been a godsend and is necessary for the continuation and expansion of the program. Not having the funding for 1 FTE and having to go back to relying on other staff to fit CREP into their workload is not an option for either CD – we couldn’t administer existing contracts, and definitely would not be able to process new contracts.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program

| | 2005 | initial 2006 | request for 06 | anticipated contracts | anticipated acres | Amount |
|--------------------|---------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Asotin | 69,638 | 17,409 | 69,638 | 2 | 80 | 69,638 |
| Benton | 18,000 | 4,500 | 18,000 | 15 | 150 | 18,000 |
| C. Klickitat | 6,000 | 1,500 | 6,000 | 2 | 25 | 3,000 |
| Chelan | 6,000 | 500 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Clark | 15,500 | 3,906 | 66,000 | 17 | 129 | 62,500 |
| Columbia | 59,000 | 14,750 | 59,000 | 5 | 500 | 59,000 |
| E Klickitat | 5,000 | 1,250 | 5,000 | 1 | 50 | - |
| Foster Creek | | | | | | - |
| Franklin | | | | | | - |
| Jefferson/Clallam | 62,500 | 15,625 | 62,500 | 7 | 49.5 | 62,500 |
| King/Pierce | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 4 | 17 | 10,000 |
| Kitsap | 6,000 | 1,500 | | | | - |
| Kittitas | | | | | | - |
| Lewis/Grays Harbor | 62,500 | 15,625 | 75,000 | 11 | 155.3 | 75,000 |
| Mason | 5,625 | 3,906 | 12,000 | 3 | 15 | 12,000 |
| No. Yakima | | | | | | - |
| Okanogan | 15,625 | 3,906 | 19,527 | 2 | 8.5 | 9,764 |
| Pacific | 15,625 | 3,906 | 15,625 | 3 | 60 | 15,625 |
| Pomeroy | 31,250 | 7,813 | 31,250 | 5 | 200 | 31,250 |
| S. Yakima | 6,000 | 1,500 | | | | - |
| Skagit | 140,000 | 20,750 | 93,000 | | | 93,000 |
| Snohomish | 31,250 | 7,813 | 38,000 | 5 | 50 | 38,000 |
| Thurston | 6,000 | 1,500 | 6,000 | 1 | 8 | 6,000 |
| Underwood | 6,000 | 1,500 | 6,000 | 1 | 10 | 3,000 |
| Wahkiakum/Cowlitz | 15,626 | 3,906 | 20,000 | 3 | 30 | 20,000 |
| Walla Walla | 83,000 | 20,750 | 83,000 | 20 | 400 | 83,000 |
| Whatcom | 197,419 | 49,355 | 197,419 | 30 | 210 | 197,419 |
| Whidbey Is. | | | | | | - |
| Whitman | 5,000 | | 5,000 | 3 | 70 | - |
| | 878,558 | 213,171 | 899,959 | 140 | 2217.3 | 869,696 |
| | | | | | | |

Recommendation

Conversations with members of the CREP committee have led to support of holding some funding back from those districts that have zero contracts. If there are landowners that visit the conservation district office and the technicians offer the CREP program that results in a pre-contract signature, funding will be provided to the district.

Attachment C

Commission Approved Initial Allocation for CREP Technical Assistance

FY 2004-05 Technical Assistance Allocation

Activity since July 1, 2004

| District | Contracts | Acres | 2005 Award | Increase over 2004 | Financial Increase / Decrease since 6/30/04 | Contracts Since 06/30/04 | TOTAL Contracts | | 1/4th Distributed on July 1, 2005 awaiting formal action by Commission Members on July 14, 2005 |
|---|-----------|-------|---------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| TIER 4. | | | | | | | | | |
| E. Klickitat | 0 | 0 | \$ 5,000.00 | Yes | | 0 | 0 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ 1,250.00 |
| Whitman | 0 | 0 | \$ 5,000.00 | Yes | | 0 | 0 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ 1,250.00 |
| Benton | 0 | 0 | \$ 5,000.00 | Yes | +13000 | 3 | 3 | \$ 5,000.00 | \$ 1,250.00 |
| Underwood | 1 | 17 | \$ 6,000.00 | Yes | | 0 | 1 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| Chelan | 2 | 5 | \$ 6,000.00 | Yes | -3000 | 0 | 2 | \$ 2,000.00 | \$ 500.00 |
| Kitsap | 2 | 5 | \$ 6,000.00 | Yes | | 1 | 3 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| Central Klickitat | 3 | 31 | \$ 6,000.00 | Yes | | 0 | 3 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| Thurston | 4 | 22 | \$ 6,000.00 | No | | 0 | 4 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Yakima | 4 | 159 | \$ 6,000.00 | No | | 0 | 4 | \$ 6,000.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| King/Pierce - Cluster | 5 | 31 | \$ 10,000.00 | No | | -1 | 4 | \$ 10,000.00 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| | | | \$ 61,000.00 | | | | 24 | \$ 57,000.00 | \$ 14,250.00 |
| TIER 3. | | | | | | | | | |
| Mason | 6 | 38 | \$ 15,625.00 | Yes | | 0 | 6 | \$ 15,625.00 | \$ 3,906.25 |
| Pacific | 5 | 101 | \$ 15,625.00 | Yes | | 0 | 5 | \$ 15,625.00 | \$ 3,906.25 |
| Okanogan | 8 | 34 | \$ 15,625.00 | Yes | +2500 | 0 | 8 | \$ 15,625.00 | \$ 3,906.25 |
| Cowlitz/Wahkiakum - Cluster | 7 | 103 | \$ 15,625.00 | Yes | | 3 | 10 | \$ 15,625.00 | \$ 3,906.25 |
| Clark | 4 | 53 | \$ 6,000.00 | No | +9500 | 6 | 10 | \$ 15,625.00 | \$ 3,906.25 |
| | | | \$ 46,875.00 | | | | 19 | \$ 46,875.00 | \$ 19,531.25 |
| TIER 2. | | | | | | | | | |
| Snohomish | 11 | 140 | \$ 31,250.00 | Yes | +6830 | 3 | 14 | \$ 31,250.00 | \$ 7,812.50 |
| Pomeroy | 50 | 1,004 | \$ 31,250.00 | Yes | | 1 | 51 | \$ 31,250.00 | \$ 7,812.50 |
| | | | \$ 62,500.00 | | | | 65 | \$ 62,500.00 | \$ 15,625.00 |
| TIER 1. | | | | | | | | | |
| Jefferson/Cllallam - Cluster | 18 | 158 | \$ 62,500.00 | Yes | | 0 | 18 | \$ 62,500.00 | \$ 15,625.00 |
| Lewis/Grays - Cluster | 26 | 567 | \$ 62,500.00 | Yes | +1700 | 2 | 28 | \$ 62,500.00 | \$ 15,625.00 |
| Asotin | 26 | 1,096 | \$ 69,638.00 | Same | | 2 | 28 | \$ 69,638.00 | \$ 17,409.50 |
| Columbia | 63 | 1,520 | \$ 59,000.00 | Same | | 3 | 66 | \$ 59,000.00 | \$ 14,750.00 |
| * Skagit | 68 | 460 | \$ 140,000.00 | No | | 2 | 70 | \$ 140,000.00 | \$ 35,000.00 |
| * Walla Walla | 94 | 2,040 | \$ 83,000.00 | No | -10000 | 15 | 109 | \$ 83,000.00 | \$ 20,750.00 |
| Whatcom | 111 | 1,129 | \$ 197,419.00 | Same | | 25 | 136 | \$ 197,419.00 | \$ 49,354.75 |
| | | | \$ 674,057.00 | | | 65 | 455 | \$ 674,057.00 | \$ 168,514.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | \$50,000 | | | | 582 | \$ 840,432.00 | \$ 217,920.50 |
| | | | \$850,000 | | | | | | |
| | | | \$900,000 | | | | | | |
| Totals | 518 | 8,713 | \$ 844,432.00 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Tier 1 - FY 2004 allocation adjusted for new contracts and | | | | | | | | | |
| Tier 2 - 1/2 FTE (Recognizing WACD Resolution) | | | | | | | | | |
| Tier 3 - 1/4 FTE (Recognizing WACD resolution) | | | | | | | | | |
| Tier 4 - \$5,000 base plus \$1,000 for new contracts written in FY 2004 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 950000*.03 | 28500 | | | |
| | | | | | 950000*.06 | 57000 | | | |
| | | | | | 950000*.08 | 76000 | | | |
| * Skagit and Walla Walla and accepted significantly less than previous year | | | | | | | | | |
| ** Reserve | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | total avail | 950000 | |
| | | | | | | | | \$ (840,432.00) | |
| | | | | | | | balance | \$ 109,568.00 | |
| | | | | | | | SCC chg | 57000 | |
| | | | | | | | balance res | \$ 52,568.00 | |

| Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program - TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PORTION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| District | TA Funds 99 | TA Funds 00 | TA Funds 01 | TA Funds 02 | TA Funds 03 | TA Funds 04 | TA Funds 05 | Total Technical Assistance | Total Contracts | \$ spent per contract | \$ spent with no contracts |
| Asotin | \$ 10,359 | \$ 32,570 | \$ 15,400 | \$ 40,000 | \$ 39,300 | \$ 69,638 | \$ 69,638 | \$ 276,905 | 28 | \$ 9,889 | |
| Benton | \$ 7,859 | \$ 10,065 | \$ 5,736 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 4,000 | \$ - | \$ 18,000 | \$ 60,660 | 3 | \$ 20,220 | |
| C. Klickitat | \$ 19,227 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 2,603 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 13,000 | \$ 4,550 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 62,380 | 3 | \$ 20,793 | |
| Chelan | \$ 33,557 | \$ 8,009 | \$ 6,850 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 3,000 | \$ 2,250 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 74,666 | 2 | \$ 37,333 | |
| Clallam | \$ 31,225 | \$ 6,741 | \$ 10,299 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 35,500 | \$ 18,300 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 148,315 | 6 | \$ 24,719 | |
| Clark | \$ 27,518 | \$ 15,713 | \$ 14,942 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 20,000 | \$ 6,650 | \$ 15,500 | \$ 115,323 | 10 | \$ 11,532 | |
| Columbia | \$ 19,388 | \$ 34,239 | \$ 24,141 | \$ 41,778 | \$ 49,000 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 286,546 | 66 | \$ 4,342 | |
| Cowlitz | \$ 32,104 | \$ 21,661 | \$ 23,698 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 6,075 | \$ 7,813 | \$ 106,350 | 5 | \$ 21,270 | |
| E Klickitat | | | \$ 2,096 | \$ 14,760 | \$ 2,500 | \$ 1,500 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 25,856 | 0 | | \$ 25,856 |
| Foster Creek | | \$ 13,936 | \$ 2,470 | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 16,406 | 0 | | \$ 16,406 |
| Franklin | \$ 2,721 | \$ 5,940 | | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 8,661 | 0 | | \$ 8,661 |
| Grays Harbor | \$ 18,051 | \$ 7,533 | \$ 9,500 | \$ 18,400 | \$ 13,000 | \$ 22,500 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 120,234 | 9 | \$ 13,359 | |
| Jefferson | \$ 19,272 | \$ 9,477 | \$ 16,273 | \$ 29,900 | \$ 27,500 | \$ 18,300 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 151,972 | 12 | \$ 12,664 | |
| King | \$ 64,815 | \$ 52,787 | \$ 18,000 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 29,500 | \$ 5,200 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 182,802 | 1 | \$ 182,802 | |
| Kitsap | \$ 4,591 | \$ 9,344 | \$ 9,040 | \$ 13,000 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 48,225 | 3 | \$ 16,075 | |
| Kittitas | \$ 29,088 | \$ 34,839 | \$ 10,533 | \$ 6,063 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 80,523 | 0 | | \$ 80,523 |
| Lewis | \$ 20,894 | \$ 50,190 | \$ 45,030 | \$ 31,050 | \$ 36,878 | \$ 22,500 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 237,792 | 19 | \$ 12,515 | |
| Mason | \$ 16,630 | \$ 20,129 | \$ 14,461 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 11,500 | \$ 7,850 | \$ 5,625 | \$ 91,195 | 6 | \$ 15,199 | |

| Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program - TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PORTION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| District | TA Funds 99 | TA Funds 00 | TA Funds 01 | TA Funds 02 | TA Funds 03 | TA Funds 04 | TA Funds 05 | Total Technical Assistance | Total Contracts | \$ spent per contract | \$ spent with no contracts |
| No. Yakima | \$ 17,843 | \$ 28,518 | \$ 5,750 | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 52,111 | 0 | | \$ 52,111 |
| Okanogan | \$ 41,860 | \$ 57,588 | \$ 44,685 | \$ 44,850 | \$ 22,500 | \$ 9,700 | \$ 15,625 | \$ 236,808 | 8 | \$ 29,601 | |
| Pacific | \$ 13,165 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 6,295 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 7,050 | \$ 15,625 | \$ 64,135 | 5 | \$ 12,827 | |
| Pierce | \$ 15,060 | \$ 25,322 | \$ 24,753 | \$ 25,300 | \$ 4,500 | \$ 5,200 | \$ 5,000 | \$ 105,135 | 3 | \$ 35,045 | |
| Pomeroy | \$ 7,747 | \$ 9,754 | \$ 26,522 | \$ 32,500 | \$ 39,000 | \$ 19,385 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 166,158 | 51 | \$ 3,258 | |
| S. Yakima | \$ 35,687 | \$ 66,879 | \$ 40,000 | \$ 15,000 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 11,950 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 183,016 | 4 | \$ 45,754 | |
| Skagit | \$ 68,445 | \$ 108,873 | \$ 170,373 | \$ 92,000 | \$ 201,927 | \$ 162,619 | \$ 140,000 | \$ 944,237 | 69 | \$ 13,685 | |
| Snohomish | \$ 64,815 | \$ 52,787 | \$ 18,000 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 14,750 | \$ 13,250 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 202,352 | 14 | \$ 14,454 | |
| Thurston | \$ 2,669 | \$ 8,329 | \$ 15,888 | \$ 16,100 | \$ 17,150 | \$ 6,700 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 72,836 | 4 | \$ 18,209 | |
| Underwood | \$ 13,764 | \$ 33,408 | \$ 16,164 | \$ 15,000 | | \$ - | \$ 6,000 | \$ 84,336 | 1 | \$ 84,336 | |
| Wahkiakum | \$ 32,104 | \$ 21,661 | \$ 23,698 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 6,075 | \$ 7,813 | \$ 106,350 | 5 | \$ 21,270 | |
| Walla Walla | \$ 16,582 | \$ 31,998 | \$ 70,950 | \$ 83,000 | \$ 91,300 | \$ 96,000 | \$ 83,000 | \$ 472,830 | 109 | \$ 4,338 | |
| Whatcom | \$ 10,372 | \$ 34,219 | \$ 133,680 | \$ 128,800 | \$ 153,680 | \$ 197,419 | \$ 197,419 | \$ 855,589 | 136 | \$ 6,291 | |
| Whidbey Is. | | | | \$ 15,000 | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 15,000 | 0 | | \$ 15,000 |
| Whitman | \$ 2,588 | \$ 2,000 | | | \$ 2,500 | \$ - | \$ 5,000 | \$ 12,088 | 0 | | \$ 12,088 |
| | \$ 689,640 | \$ 785,939 | \$ 812,430 | \$ 757,501 | \$ 825,185 | \$ 711,273 | \$ 808,919 | \$ 5,390,887 | 554 | \$ 9,731 | \$ 210,645 |

| Conservation R | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| District | | acres | average cost per acre | MINIMUM NEEDED TA Funds 06 | Projected GRAND Total TA | Anticipated Contracts 2006 | Anticipated Acres 2006 | Cumulative Projected Contracts | Projected Acres | Projected Cost per contract | Projected Cost/Acre |
| Asotin | 1165.9 | \$ 238 | \$ 69,638 | \$ 346,543 | 2 | 80 | 30 | 1245.9 | \$ 11,551 | \$ 278 | Asotin |
| Benton | 86.02 | \$ 705 | \$ 18,000 | \$ 78,660 | 15 | 150 | 18 | 236.02 | \$ 4,370 | \$ 333 | Benton |
| C. Klickitat | 31 | \$ 2,012 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 68,380 | 2 | 25 | 5 | 56 | \$ 13,676 | \$ 1,221 | C. Klickitat |
| Chelan | 4.5 | \$ 16,592 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 76,666 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.5 | \$ 38,333 | \$ 17,037 | Chelan |
| Clallam | 49.1 | \$ 3,021 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 179,565 | 2 | 3.5 | 8 | 52.6 | \$ 22,446 | \$ 3,414 | Clallam |
| Clark | 104 | \$ 1,109 | \$ 66,000 | \$ 181,323 | 17 | 129 | 27 | 233 | \$ 6,716 | \$ 778 | Clark |
| Columbia | 1592.3 | \$ 180 | \$ 59,000 | \$ 345,546 | 5 | 500 | 71 | 2092.3 | \$ 4,867 | \$ 165 | Columbia |
| Cowlitz | 130.5 | \$ 815 | | \$ 106,350 | | | 5 | 130.5 | \$ 21,270 | \$ 815 | Cowlitz |
| E Klickitat | 0 | | \$ 5,000 | \$ 30,856 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | \$ 30,856 | \$ 617 | E Klickitat |
| Foster Creek | 0 | | | \$ 16,406 | | | 0 | 0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | Foster Creek |
| Franklin | 0 | | | \$ 8,661 | | | 0 | 0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | Franklin |
| Grays Harbor | 83.5 | \$ 1,440 | \$ 30,000 | \$ 150,234 | 5 | 59.1 | 14 | 142.6 | \$ 10,731 | \$ 1,054 | Grays Harbor |
| Jefferson | 108 | \$ 1,407 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 183,222 | 5 | 46 | 17 | 154 | \$ 10,778 | \$ 1,190 | Jefferson |
| King | 22.5 | \$ 8,125 | \$ 7,500 | \$ 190,302 | 3 | 15 | 4 | 37.5 | \$ 47,576 | \$ 5,075 | King |
| Kitsap | 16.9 | \$ 2,854 | | \$ 48,225 | | | 3 | 16.9 | \$ 16,075 | | Kitsap |
| Kittitas | 0 | | | \$ 80,523 | | | 0 | 0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | Kittitas |
| Lewis | 442.2 | \$ 538 | \$ 45,000 | \$ 282,792 | 6 | 93.2 | 25 | 535.4 | \$ 11,312 | \$ 528 | Lewis |
| Mason | 37.3 | \$ 2,445 | \$ 12,000 | \$ 103,195 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 52.3 | \$ 11,466 | \$ 1,973 | Mason |

| Conservation R | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| District | | acres | average cost per acre | MINIMUM NEEDED TA Funds 06 | Projected GRAND Total TA | Anticipated Contracts 2006 | Anticipated Acres 2006 | Cumulative Projected Contracts | Projected Acres | Projected Cost per contract | Projected Cost/Acre |
| No. Yakima | 0 | | | \$ 52,111 | | | 0 | 0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | No. Yakima |
| Okanogan | 33.9 | \$ 6,985 | \$ 19,527 | \$ 256,335 | 2 | 8.5 | 10 | 42.4 | \$ 25,634 | \$ 6,046 | Okanogan |
| Pacific | 62.3 | \$ 1,029 | \$ 15,265 | \$ 79,400 | 3 | 60 | 8 | 122.3 | \$ 9,925 | \$ 649 | Pacific |
| Pierce | 5.1 | \$ 20,615 | \$ 2,500 | \$ 107,635 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7.1 | \$ 26,909 | \$ 15,160 | Pierce |
| Pomeroy | 1044.8 | \$ 159 | \$ 31,250 | \$ 197,408 | 5 | 200 | 56 | 1244.8 | \$ 3,525 | \$ 159 | Pomeroy |
| S. Yakima | 158.9 | \$ 1,152 | | \$ 183,016 | | | 4 | 158.9 | \$ 45,754 | \$ 1,152 | S. Yakima |
| Skagit | 473 | \$ 1,996 | \$ 93,350 | \$ 1,037,587 | | | 69 | 473 | \$ 15,037 | \$ 2,194 | Skagit |
| Snohomish | 208.1 | \$ 972 | \$ 38,000 | \$ 240,352 | 5 | 50 | 19 | 258.1 | \$ 12,650 | \$ 931 | Snohomish |
| Thurston | 22 | \$ 3,311 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 78,836 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 30 | \$ 15,767 | \$ 2,628 | Thurston |
| Underwood | 17 | \$ 4,961 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 90,336 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 27 | \$ 45,168 | \$ 3,346 | Underwood |
| Wahkiakum | 87.6 | \$ 1,214 | \$ 20,000 | \$ 126,350 | 3 | 30 | 8 | 117.6 | \$ 15,794 | \$ 1,074 | Wahkiakum |
| Walla Walla | 2419.8 | \$ 195 | \$ 83,000 | \$ 555,830 | 20 | 400 | 129 | 2819.8 | \$ 4,309 | \$ 197 | Walla Walla |
| Whatcom | 1240.7 | \$ 690 | \$ 197,419 | \$ 1,053,008 | 30 | 210 | 166 | 1450.7 | \$ 6,343 | \$ 726 | Whatcom |
| Whidbey Is. | 0 | | | \$ 15,000 | | | 0 | 0 | #DIV/0! | #DIV/0! | Whidbey Is. |
| Whitman | 0 | | 5,000.00 | \$ 17,088 | 3 | 70 | 3 | 70 | \$ 5,696 | \$ 244 | Whitman |
| | 8481.02 | \$ 636 | \$ 899,949 | \$ 6,221,198 | 140 | 2214.3 | | 10615 | | \$ 586 | |